

**Outstanding Issues for Consideration
at the July 18, 2011 APC Meeting**
Springmill Trails PUD
Community Development Department | City of Westfield

This is an executive summary of items that are either unresolved or need further discussion at the APC Meeting on July 18, 2011.

1. Front Yard Setbacks for Garages. When this petition was initially reviewed in January, there was some discussion about requiring attached garages to be setback behind the front plane of the dwelling. The City's Zoning Ordinance does not have such a requirement. If not having this requirement is a problem, then the APC may wish to discuss this topic at the meeting.
2. Minimum Distance Between SF-A Structures. The PUD proposal would reduce the City's standard from 25 feet to 20 feet. Unless there is an actual project proposal that would dictate a shorter distance between structures, then staff does not support altering this standard at this time. The APC may wish to invite the petitioner to explain the rationale for modifying this standard.
3. Maximum Building Height. The PUD proposal would increase the maximum building height in Residential District 2 and in the Multi-Family section. Unless there is an actual project proposal that would dictate taller building heights, then staff does not support altering these standards at this time. The APC may wish to invite the petitioner to explain the rationale for the proposed variations from the City's Zoning Ordinance regarding maximum building heights.
4. Minimum Building Square Footage. The PUD proposal would decrease the minimum square footage of dwellings in the Residential 2 District from City standards. Unless there is an actual project proposal that would dictate smaller buildings, then staff does not support altering these standards at this time. The APC may wish to invite the petitioner to explain the rationale for the proposed standards.
5. Variety of Housing Types. The PUD proposal establishes that up to seventy (70) percent of all dwellings in Residential District 2 could be a single type of dwelling. When this petition was initially reviewed in January, there was some discussion about that percentage being too high. No suggested alternative to seventy (70) percent was offered, however. The APC may wish to discuss this item at the meeting.

6. Amenity Installation Timing. The PUD proposal establishes that amenities will be installed no later than the completion of fifty (50) percent of the dwellings within each district. It has been suggested in that they be installed sooner. Staff's question is, how do you know when you have fifty (50) percent until you are done building? Staff's suggestion is that an empirical number (i.e. minimum number of dwellings, or a specific date in time) be tied to this standard. The APC may wish to discuss this item at the meeting.
7. Minimum Building Square Footage in the Market Center District. Similar to the recent Oak Ridge Pointe PUD amendment that was reviewed and approved, the Springmill Trails PUD proposal includes a minimum square footage for buildings within the State Road 32 corridor. The proposal would require a building to be at least 3,000 feet in size. Since the Springmill Trails PUD was introduced, the City has adopted the State Highway 32 Overlay Zone, which establishes a minimum building size of 5,000 square feet. This is a new issue for this petition and the APC may want to discuss if it is appropriate to reduce the State Highway 32 Overlay standard for this PUD or stay with the overlay standard.
8. Multi-Family Building Materials. The City's Zoning Ordinance requires the City's Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of each elevation be either brick or EIFS and would allow vinyl on the remaining 25% of the elevation. The PUD proposal requires a minimum of 30% brick on all sides of a multi-family building, with masonry or Natural Materials (meaning: brick, wood, limestone, fiber cement siding, or natural stone) covering the remaining 70%. Vinyl siding is not a permitted material on Multi-Family dwellings in the PUD. The PUD proposal is a substantial departure from the Zoning Ordinance and the APC may wish to discuss this item at the meeting.
9. Parking Space Distance from an Entrance. The PUD proposal doubles the City's required maximum distance parking areas can be from a business entrance. The proposal may make sense depending on the design of the project, but City's standard has not been an issue for commercial development in the past. Unless there is an actual project proposal that would dictate the location of parking further from a business entrance, then staff does not support altering this standard at this time. The APC may wish to invite the petitioner to explain the rationale for modifying this standard.
10. Bicycle Parking for SF-A. When this petition was initially reviewed in January, there was some discussion about requiring bicycle parking in the single-family attached areas. The City's Zoning Ordinance does not have such a requirement (though nothing would prohibit installing them). If not having this requirement is a problem, then the APC may wish to discuss this topic at the meeting.

- 11. Maximum Number of Bicycle Parking Spaces.** The PUD proposal establishes a cap on the number of bicycle parking spaces would be provided in a multi-family development. Staff's suggestion is to alter the ratio standard to require fewer spaces, rather than establish a cap. The APC may wish to discuss this topic at the meeting.
- 12. Commercial District Uses.** When this petition was initially reviewed in January, there was some question regarding why residential uses are permitted in this district. The APC may wish to invite the petitioner to explain the rationale for the proposed uses.
- 13. Density.** The APC may wish to discuss the density of the project with the petitioner. The submitted comparison chart indicates that the density of Residential District 1 has been reduced from what the existing Eagletown PUD allows in the same area. Staff's independent calculation could not confirm this statement.